

REMARKS

The Official Action dated September 7, 2004, has been carefully considered. Accordingly, the changes presented herein, taken with the following remarks, are believed sufficient to place the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 21 through 60 are currently pending. Attorneys for Applicants conducted a telephonic interview with the Examiner on January 28, 2005, after which Applicants filed an After Final Amendment on February 3, 2005. On March 8, 2005, the Examiner entered an Advisory Action stating that none of the amendments set forth in the February 3, 2005 Amendment would be entered, but stated that proposed claims 21, 24-26, and 28 would be allowable as amended, subject to an updated search and the other claims being cancelled.

By present amendment, claims 22, 23, 27, and 29 through 60 are cancelled. Claims 21, 24-26, and 28 have been amended, and now stand in the form that the Examiner indicated would be allowable. Also, new claim 138 has been added. This claim depends upon claim 23, which the Examiner has indicated as being allowable, and pertains to the reciprocal nature of the matching process. Care has been taken to avoid the introduction of new matter. Entry of new claim 138 is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to claims 36, 37, and 59 due to certain informalities. The objection is traversed. By present amendment, claims 36, 37 and 59 are cancelled. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 21-60 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Kurzius et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,385,620). The rejection is traversed. As noted above, while Applicant does not agree that Kurzius anticipates all elements of claims 21-60, by present amendment claims 22, 23, 27, and 29 through 60 have been cancelled. Claims 21, 24-26 and 28 have been amended to describe the use of enhancement

data objects as recited therein, and now are in the form that the Examiner has indicated would be allowable. Accordingly, the rejection has been traversed, and reconsideration and an early allowance are respectfully requested.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 21-60, and the objection to claims 36, 37, and 59, have been traversed, and reconsideration is respectfully requested. It is believed that the above represents a complete response to the objection and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), and places the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and an early allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

W. Edward Ramage, Reg. No. 50,810
Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell &
Berkowitz, PC
211 Commerce Street, Suite 1000
Nashville, TN 37201
615-726-5771